> It may well be the instant invention is novel in its method of using a series of ropes but the current claim language does not clearly claim this.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's analysis set forth above. Magazzu merely sets forth a prior version of a portable strike zone and does not set forth an entire portable playing field. In the examiner's example, merely practicing Magazzu by setting up its device on a conventional field without the other items required in the pending claim would not result in infringement of the applicant's claim. A portable strike zone would have to be set up with the other items to infringe the claim which as noted by the examiner is novel. Thus, applicant's device is both an improvement upon Magazzu as well as an adaptation of Magazzu from a conventional baseball game to a plastic bat and ball game. It is for this reason that applicant submits the examiner is improperly using hindsight since none of the cited references disclose applicant's invention as claimed.

Applicant has amended the pending claim in order to more particularly describe the invention. As such, Applicant submits that the pending claim is now in position for allowance and requests such prompt action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: August 15, 2005

By: _____

Arthur M. Peslak, Esq.
Reg. No. 35,642

Mandel & Peslak, LLC
80 Scenic Drive, Suite 5
Freehold, NJ 07728
Tel No.: (732) 761-1610
Fax No.: (732) 761-1611